

# The Democratic Standard

DEVOTED TO THE SUPPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS—THE DIFFUSION OF GENERAL INTELLIGENCE—AND THE REFORM OF ALL POLITICAL ABUSES

BY D. P. PALMER.

GEORGETOWN, O., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1845

NEW SERIES.—VOL. V. No 31.

## TERMS OF THE STANDARD.

FOR ONE YEAR, IN ADVANCE, 20  
WITHIN THE YEAR, 2  
AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE YEAR.  
If the subscriber will be considered in advance  
if the paper will be discontinued, (unless  
the subscriber has paid for the paper,) until all  
arrearages are paid.

PRICES OF ADVERTISING.  
\$1.00 (12 lines) three insertions.  
\$2.00 (12 lines) each subsequent insertion, 25  
For six months, 5.00  
For twelve months, 10.00  
Larger advertisements will be charged in  
proportion.

A reasonable deduction will be made on  
advertisements for a long term.  
All orders for advertising or job-work must  
be accompanied by the cash, except from those  
whom we have previously dealt with on credit.  
Office in the north end of the Market Building.

## SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN W. TIBBATS,

OF KENTUCKY.

On the reannexation of Texas—delivered  
in the House of Representatives Janu-  
ary 13, 1845.

(Concluded.)

Mr. John Quincy Adams, in a letter to  
Don Olin of the 12th March, 1828, says:  
"The claim of France always did extend  
westward to the Rio Bravo." She always  
claimed the territory which you call Tex-  
as, as being within the limits, and form-  
ing a part of Louisiana." And he fur-  
ther says: "Well might Mr. Pinckney  
and Monroe write to Mr. Cevallos in  
1805 that the claim of the United States  
to the boundary of the Rio Bravo was as  
clear as the right to the island of New  
Orleans." And in his letter of the 31st  
October, 1818, he says: "Our title to  
Texas is established beyond the power of  
human controversy." Mr. Adams, in  
his letter of instructions to Mr. George  
Graham of June 2, 1818, says:

"The President wishes you to proceed  
with all convenient speed to that place  
(Gulveston,) unless, as is not improbable,  
you should, in the progress of the jour-  
ney, learn that they have abandoned or  
been driven from it. Should they have  
moved to Matagorda, or any other place  
north of the Rio Bravo, and within the  
territory claimed by the United States,  
you will repair thither, without, however,  
expanding yourself to be captured by any  
Spanish military force. When arrived  
you will, in a suitable manner, make  
known to the chief or leader of the ex-  
pedition your authority from the govern-  
ment of the United States, and express  
the surprise with which the President has  
been possessed that taken without au-  
thority from the United States, of a  
place within their territorial limits, and  
upon which no lawful settlement can be  
made without their sanction. You will  
call upon him explicitly to show under  
what national authority they profess to  
act, and take care that due warning be  
given to the whole body that there is a  
place within the United States, who will  
make no permanent settlement to be  
made there, under any authority other  
than their own."

Mr. Clay in his speech on the Spanish  
treaty, April 8, 1823, (Malloy, vol. I, p.  
400 and 401,) said:  
"The title to the Perdido on the one  
side and to the Rio del Norte on the  
other, rested on the same principle—the  
priority of discovery, and of occupation  
by France; the principle observed among  
European nations having contiguous set-  
tlements being that the unoccupied space  
between them should be equally divided."  
In 1855 he (La Salle) made an establish-  
ment on the Bay of St. Bernard, west of  
the Colorado, emptying into it. The near-  
est Spanish settlement was Panuco, and  
the Rio del Norte, about the midway line,  
became the common boundary."

Mr. Clay also, in his letter of the 17th  
April, 1844, published in the National  
Intelligencer, says:

"The United States acquired a title to  
Texas, extending, as I believe, to the  
Rio del Norte, by the treaty of Louisiana,  
he ceded and relinquished that title to  
Spain by the treaty of 1819, by which the  
Sabine was substituted for the Rio del  
Norte as our western boundary."

Mr. T. said it seemed to him that these  
facts and opinions clearly established the  
position that Texas never was "geographi-  
cally considered as comprising any part  
or portion of New Spain, or Mexico, or  
New Mexico, but was a distinct country,  
separated from them by the Rio del  
Norte." He thought that he would be  
able to establish as clearly that Texas  
was not now, and never had been, an in-  
tegral part under the dominion of Mexi-  
co, under the form of government now  
existing, or which ever had existed in that  
country, but that Texas never had sub-  
mitted to the jurisdiction of any power  
whatever, but always from the time of  
the cession to Spain, and asserted and  
maintained her independence of Spain, of  
Mexico, and of all the world. "On the  
cession of that country to Spain, by the  
treaty of 1819, the people of Texas met

a convention at Nacogdoches, and sol-  
emnly protested against being transferred,  
like slaves, to a foreign despot, and de-  
clared themselves a free and independ-  
ent people by the following manifesto  
to:

[For the want of room, we omit the  
manifesto.—Standard]

From the hour in which that declara-  
tion of independence was made, the peo-  
ple of Texas have never submitted to  
the yoke or dominion of any other nation  
on earth; but, true to the spirit and char-  
acter of their ancestors, they have, thro'  
various vicissitudes and reverses, battled  
on for freedom, and successfully main-  
tained their independence; for

"Freedom's battle once begun,  
Bequeathed from bleeding sire to son,  
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

At this time, "under the Spanish gov-  
ernment, Texas was a separate and dis-  
tinct province. As such it had a distinct  
local organization." (Roote's History of  
Texas, page 62.) And at the time Tex-  
as revolted from Spain, Mexico was a  
distinct province under the dominion of  
Spain, from which she did not declare  
her independence until the adoption of  
the Plan of Iguala, at the city of Iguala,  
on the 14th February, 1821. For, though  
external commotions and revolutions had  
internal in that country from the time they  
were commenced by the curate Hidalgo,  
in 1810, they were controversies between  
the natives and European Spaniards, for  
power in the country, and not for the  
purpose of throwing off the Spanish yoke.  
The independence of Mexico was ac-  
knowledged by the treaty of Cordova,  
entered into between Don John O'Don-  
oghue, the Spanish general, and Don Augus-  
tin de Iturbide, the general of the Mexi-  
can armies, on the 24th of August, 1821.

[We also omit the treaty of Cordova.]

But that treaty had no reference to  
Texas whatever; it treated of "New Spain"  
alone. After Iturbide was executed,  
Texas and Coahuila, in 1824, joined the  
Mexican confederacy—but they joined  
as a separate and independent State.  
Their constitution adopted at Saltillo, 11th  
March, 1827, declares:

"Article 1. The State of Coahuila and  
Texas consists in the union of all its in-  
habitants."  
"It is free and independent of the  
other United Mexican States, and every  
other foreign power and dominion."  
—Kennedy's Tex. vol. 2 App. No. 11, p.  
415.

Thus as a free and independent nation  
they entered the Mexican confederacy,  
and as such they were received.

In October, 1832, Texas held a sepa-  
rate convention from Coahuila to form a  
State constitution for herself, and a sec-  
ond convention on the 1st April, 1832,  
according to the guaranty of the consti-  
tutional act of the constituent Congress  
of Mexico of the 7th May, 1824—this  
latter convention framed and adopted a  
constitution for the State of Texas as a  
separate and distinct and independent  
member of the Mexican federation, to be  
submitted to the national government,  
with a memorial praying for the admission  
of Texas into the Mexican Union, in con-  
formity with the terms of the federal  
compact—but their messenger, Mr. Austin,  
on his arrival in Mexico, was impris-  
oned. Texas, nevertheless, in conjunc-  
tion with Coahuila, continued as an in-  
dependent State in the Mexican confeder-  
ation until 1834 and 1835, when the  
rights of the republic of Mexico were  
overthrown, and a military central con-  
solation elected on the 5th October, 1835,  
by Santa Anna, upon its ruins. The peo-  
ple of Texas refused to enter into this  
new government. They were oppressed  
by the Mexican power and their local leg-  
islature abolished.

On the 7th Nov. 1835, by a Council  
of deputies of the people, the Texans in-  
sured a manifesto, in which, after recit-  
ing that Santa Anna and other military chief-  
tains had dissolved the social compact  
existing between Texas and the other  
members of the confederacy, solemnly  
declared that they had taken up arms  
in defence of their rights and liberties,  
and in defence of the republican principles  
of the federal constitution of Mexico of  
1824—that Texas was no longer morally  
or civilly bound by the compact of Union  
—that they do not acknowledge that the  
present authorities of the present  
nominal Mexican republic have the right  
to govern within the limits of Texas—  
and that they hold it to be their right,  
during the disorganization of the federal  
system, and the reign of despotism, to  
withdraw from the Union, to establish an  
independent government, or to adopt  
such measures as they may deem best  
calculated to protect their rights and lib-  
erties.

War was made upon the people of Tex-  
as. They resisted—and, by a council of  
deputies of the people, established a pro-  
visional government—which, on the 7th  
November, 1835, issued the following  
manifesto:

"Whereas General Antonio Lopez de  
Santa Anna, and other military chieftains,  
have, by force of arms, overthrown the  
federal constitution of Mexico, and dis-  
solved the social compact which existed  
between Texas and the other members  
of the confederacy, now the good people  
of Texas, availing themselves of their  
natural right, solemnly declare—

"First. That they have taken up arms  
in defence of their rights and liberties,  
which were threatened by encroachments  
of military despots, and in defence of the  
republican principles of the federal con-  
stitution of Mexico of 1824.

"Second. That Texas is no longer  
morally or civilly bound by the compact  
of union—yet, stimulated by the gener-  
osity and sympathy common to a free  
people, they offer their support and assis-  
tance to such of the members of the Mexi-  
can confederacy as will take up arms  
against military despotism.

"Third. That they do not acknowledge  
that the present authorities of the pre-  
sent nominal Mexican republic have the  
right to govern within the limits of Tex-  
as.

"Fifth. That they hold it to be their  
right, during the disorganization of the  
federal system, and the reign of despotism,  
to withdraw from the Union, to estab-  
lish an independent government, or to  
adopt such measures as they may deem  
best calculated to protect their rights and  
liberties; but that they will continue  
faithful to the Mexican government so  
long as that nation is governed by the  
constitution and laws that were framed  
for the government of the political as-  
sociation."

Their country was invaded by the  
order of the usurper Santa Anna; the in-  
vasion was successfully resisted by the  
people of Texas—the Mexican army, to-  
gether with their leader, Gen. Cos, was  
captured—and, in the articles of capitulation  
of the 11th December, 1835, it was stipu-  
lated—

"That General Cos and his officers re-  
tire, with their arms and private property,  
into the interior of the republic, under  
parole of honor that they will not, in any  
way, oppose the re-establishment of the  
federal constitution of 1824."

On the 2d March, 1836, the people of  
Texas, by their delegates assembled in  
convention at Washington, declared their  
independence, as follows:

"We, therefore, the delegates, with plen-  
ary powers of the people of Texas, in  
solemn convention assembled, appealing to  
a candid world for the necessities of our  
condition, do hereby resolve and declare  
that our political connexion with the  
Mexican nation has forever ended; and  
that the people of Texas do now consti-  
tute a FREE, SOVEREIGN AND IN-  
DEPENDENT REPUBLIC, and are fully  
invested with all the rights and attri-  
butes which properly belong to indepen-  
dent nations—and, conscious of the recti-  
tude of our intentions, we fearlessly and  
confidently submit the issue to the su-  
preme arbiter of the destinies of nations."

The parole of honor of General Cos  
was violated, and he retained with Santa  
Anna, with another invading army of 8,  
000 men, who openly avowed his inten-  
tion to devote to indiscriminate slaughter  
all who should resist his authority; but  
Santa Anna and his army were overthrown  
and captured, on the plains of San Jacinto,  
on the 21st April, 1836.

Alluding to this great event, the Com-  
mittee on Foreign Relations, of the Sen-  
ate, in a unanimous report of the 18th  
June, 1836, through Mr. Clay, as chair-  
man, unanimously adopted by the Senate,  
declared that—

"The recent signal and splendid victory  
in which that portion of the Mexican  
army which was commanded by General  
Santa Anna, the President of the Mexi-  
can Government, in person was entirely  
overthrown with unexampled slaughter,  
compared with the inconsiderable loss  
on the other side, put to flight and cap-  
tured including among the prisoners the  
President himself and his staff, may be con-  
sidered as decisive of the independence of  
Texas."

Notwithstanding all the efforts of Mexi-  
co to subdue her, Texas has successfully  
resisted that power, and maintained her  
independence to this day. Mexico, in  
fact, never had a right, according to the  
law of nations, to one foot of land in  
Texas. The United States are under no  
obligations to consult her. The admis-  
sion of Texas into the Union will, in no  
degree, compromise the honor of this na-  
tion, or violate its faith in its treaty with  
Mexico. Mexico, in fact, had no right  
to interfere in the matter, and we are  
under no obligations to consult her in re-  
lation to it.

So much, then (said Mr. T.) for the  
honor of this country. But (said Mr. T.)  
what honor is the subject, and the good  
faith of this nation is under consideration  
be begged leave to call the attention of  
the committee to another important fact.  
By the third article of the treaty of Loui-  
siana (Laws of the United States, vol. I,  
p. 136) it was provided that—

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory  
shall be incorporated in the United States  
and admitted as soon as possible, ac-  
cording to the principles of the federal con-  
stitution, to the enjoyment of all the  
rights, advantages, and immunities of  
citizens of the United States—and in the  
mean time, they shall be maintained and  
protected in the free enjoyment of their  
liberty, property, and the religion which  
they profess."

Now he asked if the obligations of that  
treaty were not violated when Texas was  
ceded to Spain by the treaty of 1819,  
without consulting France or the people  
of the Territory? and if the United States  
were not bound by the principles of jus-  
tice and good faith to perform the stipu-  
lations in that treaty now, when they had  
it in their power to do so, and thus as far  
as they were able, do justice to an injur-  
ed people?

Mr. Clay, (said Mr. T.) at the time,  
denied the right of the United States,  
under the treaty making power, to cede  
that country to Spain. Mr. Clay in 18-  
20, introduced the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the constitution of the  
United States vests in Congress the power  
to dispose of the territory belonging to  
them—and that no treaty purporting to  
alienate any portion thereof is valid  
without the concurrence of Congress."

Mr. Clay most strenuously opposed  
the measure as being both unconstitu-  
tional and inexpedient. The proposition  
asserted by the resolution just quoted  
was sufficiently maintained by barely  
reading the clause in the constitution on  
which it rested:

"The Congress shall have the power  
to dispose, &c. of the territory or other  
property belonging to the United States."  
He said that

"All accounts concurred in represent-  
ing Texas to be extremely valuable.—  
Its superficial extent was three or four  
times greater than that of Florida. The  
climate was delicious—the soil fertile—  
the margins of the rivers abounding in  
live oak—and the country admitting of  
easy settlement. It possessed moreover,  
if he were not misinformed, one of the  
finest ports in the Gulf of Mexico. The  
production of which it was capable were  
suitable to our wants. He would not  
give Texas for Florida in a naked ex-  
change."

Thus did Mr. Clay oppose the transfer  
of that country, and he never lost sight  
of the reigning of it. But he (Mr. T.)  
contended that the cession of Texas to  
Spain, was not only a breach of faith with  
France, but a violation of the rights of  
the people of Texas, and absolutely null  
and void, so far as the people of Texas  
were concerned, upon another ground.

There was (said Mr. T.) no plainer  
principle in the law of nations, Vattel (p.  
196, sec. 105) lays down the law of na-  
tions expressly to be, that  
"A sovereign already bound by a treaty  
cannot enter into others contrary to the  
first. The things respecting which he  
has entered into engagements are no  
longer at his disposal. If it happens that  
a posterior treaty be found, in any par-  
ticular point, to clash with one of more  
ancient date, the new treaty is null and  
void in respect to that point, inasmuch as  
it tends to dispose of a thing that is no  
longer in the power of him who appears  
to dispose of it."

He (Mr. T.) concluded, then, that Texas  
had a perfect right, by the provisions  
of the treaty of Louisiana, to admission  
into the Union. The admission of Tex-  
as, instead of violating the faith of our  
treaty with Mexico, will be a compliance  
with our faith, pledged in the treaty with  
France. Instead of soiling the honor of  
the nation, instead of breaking treaty stipu-  
lations, it will restore and perform the  
obligations of a treaty already broken.—  
He (Mr. T.) thought that the United  
States could not deny to Texas admis-  
sion into the Union without a violation of  
every principle of honor, of justice, and  
good faith.

This he (Mr. T.) considered as a na-  
tional question, which should not be de-  
cided on sectional views. But if sectional  
views were to be taken, he conceived  
that it would be found that the western  
States and the eastern States were those  
most deeply interested in it; and instead  
of its being a southern question, it would  
be found to be a western and an eastern  
question. The attempt to reannex Tex-  
as first proceeded from one of the repre-  
sentatives from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams)  
aided by a gentleman from Kentucky,  
[Mr. Clay] and it was for to presume  
that, if those distinguished gentlemen  
were guided at all by sectional feeling  
in relation to the measure, their minds  
were influenced by the interests of the  
East and West at that day. Nothing how-  
ever, was then said of its being a southern  
question, or a party question, or a slave  
question, and both upon the slave ques-  
tion and her interests in manufactures, he  
considered that the position now assumed  
by Massachusetts was, and would prove

to be, as compels an error local as she  
could be placed in.

He (Mr. T.) did not so far as he knew  
himself, and was capable of judging of  
of his own feelings and opinions, give to  
the slave question, which had been raised  
here, the weight of one feather in in-  
fluencing his mind in favor of the rean-  
nexation of Texas. He lived on the  
very line of demarcation between the free  
and slave interests of this Union, and he  
was able to look upon this subject with  
calmness, and he would say that he did  
not give that weight to the question of  
slavery that he should be induced to vote  
for this reannexation with the view of  
extending the bounds of that institution.

Many of his constituents were the own-  
ers of slaves, they were their property,  
acknowledged as such, and secured to  
them by the constitution of the Union—  
and so long as he had the honor of a seat  
on this floor, he would not submit to an  
invasion of, or interference with, their  
constitutional rights or domestic institu-  
tion upon this or any other subject, by  
this or any other government or people.—  
But if the people of Texas desired it, and  
proposed themselves to be annexed as a  
free State, he would give his vote as freely  
for it as he would if it were to be an-  
nexed as a slave State—that was a ques-  
tion for the people of Texas to settle  
themselves.

This question of the reannexation of  
Texas had continued long to be a ques-  
tion of great interest throughout this  
Union—it was never made a party ques-  
tion until the recent presidential canvass,  
and it decided the result of that election,  
the fiat of the people had gone for it in a  
voice which could not be misunderstood.  
Gentlemen might deny that the question  
had been settled by the people. He (Mr.  
T.) thought otherwise. On the subject  
of the tariff and distribution, there was  
not that unanimity that there was on this  
question. On the question of reannexa-  
tion there was no difference—there was  
no dispute in the democratic ranks, and  
besides there were a vast number of  
whigs in favor of the measure, the ma-  
jority of the people of the United States  
in favor of reannexation was much greater  
than the majority of Mr. Polk over  
Mr. Clay. If there was one question  
however that was involved in the late  
canvass throughout the wide expanse of  
this Union—through every State, in every  
county and town and hamlet—it was  
this question of the reannexation of Tex-  
as. There was no question which was  
so much and so universally mooted—and  
Mr. Clay was opposed on the ground of  
his supposed hostility to it, though he  
was nevertheless supported by many of  
the whig party on other questions, who  
were notwithstanding, in favor of reannex-  
ation. Mr. Polk was supported because  
he was in favor of the measure, and he  
believed opposed by all who were op-  
posed to it. It might not comport with the  
views of the gentlemen of the North, to  
whose course he did not intend to make  
objections, as that was a matter of their  
own concern and not his—but he begged  
the committee to look upon the question  
as it ought to be viewed—is a national  
question, and not one simply involving  
local feelings or mere local interests,  
or to be decided upon such contracted  
views.

If being within one minute of the ex-  
piration of the hour allotted him, Mr. T.  
said he would not, as he had not time, en-  
ter into views he had desired to present  
to the committee upon other questions  
arising out of the subject under debate,  
and he therefore yielded the floor.

There was a report yesterday, that the  
agents of the State of Illinois, Messrs.  
Oakley and Leavitt, were robbed of their  
papers and securities, on the National  
Road, on their return home a few days  
since. The trunk was cut from the  
stage boot. Such a loss must prove ex-  
ceedingly vexatious to the parties, as  
the papers cannot be renewed without  
much delay, even if no money were lost  
with the papers.—Phila. U. S. Gazette.

THE BANK BILL.  
This doleful concern is still on the  
anvil, and forging chains for the people.  
The Cincinnati Chronicle says, "that part  
which relates to a State Bank and bran-  
ches will, we believe, be inoperative."  
Whether the general banking be useful  
or not, will depend a good deal on the  
amendments. From this it would seem  
that the friends of the bill, do not expect  
the people will ever touch it. A burial  
child, they say, dreads the fire; we have  
yet to see whether the whigs have as  
much faith in a child.—Statesman.

THE PORTLAND BULLETIN tells a good story  
of a certain good Deacon, whose hat  
blew off and led him a long chase after it  
through the street. At length the Deacon  
became exhausted in the race, and  
pulled up against a post by the side walk.  
A gentleman came along, to whom the  
Deacon addressed himself thus: "My  
friend, I am a Deacon of the Church,  
and it is very wrong for me to swear, you  
will therefore greatly oblige me, if you  
will do—that hat for me."

THIRSTING AND HOING.  
Scene, a cornfield—men with hoes—  
time, eleven o'clock, A. M.  
Eater squire, the owner of the field.  
One of the men, speaks—"Squire, it's  
eleven o'clock you know and we are thirst-  
ing and the scriptures say—"If any thirst,  
let him come and drink!"  
Squire—"Aye, but the Squire also  
says—"Don't ever one that thirsteth!"

From a New York Paper.

## ROMANCE IN REAL LIFE.

"Married, on Tuesday, (not last,) by  
the Rev. William Ask, Thomas Mo-  
witt and Charlotte Conroy, both of this  
city."

The above Marriage was consummated  
in this city on Tuesday week—and there-  
by hangs a tale. Mr. Mowitt is a re-  
spectable shoemaker, who keeps several  
men employed, and among the rest was  
John Pelting, who had ingrained himself  
so much in his favor by his faithful and  
industrious and sobriety, that he took him  
in partnership about three years ago, and  
had no cause to regret his kindness.—From  
that time Mr. Mowitt and Mr. Pelting  
were constant friends and companions,  
and, boarded at the same house until  
about twelve months ago, when one day  
they were subpoenaed on a Corner's jury,  
about to be held over the body of a man  
that had been taken out of the river at  
the foot of Maiden Lane. The deceased  
had all the appearance of being a regu-  
lar dock laborer, and it was the opinion  
of all present, that he had fallen into the  
slip while in a state of intoxication but  
the verdict which was presently given,  
was merely "found drowned."

The jury being dismissed, Mr. Mowitt  
turned round to look for his friend and  
fellow juror, who had been at his side till  
that moment, but he was gone, and he  
thought he saw him running full speed up  
Maiden Lane. This struck him as being  
curious, and also reminded him of  
another curious fact—at least curious as  
connected with his sudden flight—namely  
that when Mr. Pelting had first glanced  
at the face of that corpse, he started and  
turned deadly pale. Mr. M. then pro-  
ceeded to his boarding house, and thence  
to the store, to look for his partner; but  
he had not been to either, nor did he  
return, and nothing could be heard of  
him. He gave up all further inquir-  
ies, thinking there must have been some  
mysterious connection between Mr. Pel-  
ting and the man that was found drowned  
and that in consequence thereof, he had  
in all probability, made away with him-  
self.

So matters rested until a certain day  
last summer, when a lady called on Mr.  
Mowitt, at his store, and asked for Mr. Pel-  
ting.—She was told the particulars of  
this story.

"And has he not been here since?"  
she anxiously inquired.

"Not since," was the reply.

"I know he has," returned the lady.

"He has not, I assure you—at least not  
to my knowledge," replied Mr. Mowitt.

"But I am positive," said the lady.

"What proof have you of it?" inquired  
Mr. Mowitt.

"The best in the world," replied the la-  
dy, "for I am here, and Mr. Pelting and  
myself are one and the same person."

And strange as it may seem, such was  
the fact.

The question then was, whether Mr.  
Pelting was a lady, and it turned out she  
was a lady, and that her name was Char-  
lotte Conroy, and furthermore, that she  
was the widow of the man found drown-  
ed. She then stated that her husband  
was a shoemaker in Philadelphia, and  
that she had been two years married—  
that her husband whose name was Con-  
roy took to drinking, and treated her bad-  
ly—having no children, she used to spend  
her leisure hours sitting by and mending  
shoes for her husband, intending as soon  
as she could finish her trade to leave a  
drunken man and work her way through  
the world alone. Having equipped her-  
self in men's clothes she left her husband  
and mother, and soon arrived in New  
York. Of her success as a journeyman,  
foreman and partner we have seen  
above.

As soon as the Coroners Inquest was  
finished she started for Philadelphia  
where she learned that her husband who  
had become a wandering loafer, had  
a week before set out for New York, where  
instead of finding an injured wife, he  
found a wretched grave.

The Portland Bulletin tells a good story  
of a certain good Deacon, whose hat  
blew off and led him a long chase after it  
through the street. At length the Deacon  
became exhausted in the race, and  
pulled up against a post by the side walk.  
A gentleman came along, to whom the  
Deacon addressed himself thus: "My  
friend, I am a Deacon of the Church,  
and it is very wrong for me to swear, you  
will therefore greatly oblige me, if you  
will do—that hat for me."

THIRSTING AND HOING.  
Scene, a cornfield—men with hoes—  
time, eleven o'clock, A. M.  
Eater squire, the owner of the field.  
One of the men, speaks—"Squire, it's  
eleven o'clock you know and we are thirst-  
ing and the scriptures say—"If any thirst,  
let him come and drink!"  
Squire—"Aye, but the Squire also  
says—"Don't ever one that thirsteth!"